

THE COMPOSITION OF HOSEA

by

BRIAN PECKHAM

339 Bloor St., West, Suite 217
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1W7

Nowadays it is taken for granted that Hosea was active in the Northern Kingdom in the quarter century or so before the fall of Samaria and that his life story and utterances were collected, recorded, and codified by disciples and editors in the Southern Kingdom during his lifetime and intermittently until sometime after the fall of Jerusalem.¹ The theory seems plausible since it might explain why the first three chapters are narrative and quite separate from the rest and why the last eleven chapters are composed of oddly arranged and strangely inconsequential oracles. But its apparent correspondence with the literary facts also gives it the allure of historical reality—as if it were not a theory at all but really happened—and this in turn allows the literary problems to be resolved by matching bits and pieces of difficult texts with familiar historical contexts.² However, it is just a theory, and it may or may not be true, but there is no way of knowing because it cannot be verified.

The theory's resistance to verification is not perceived as problematic because at every crucial point it is linked to some other hypothesis, assumption or belief. The idea that the text of Hosea was transcribed from an original oral presentation and scholarly transmission might be true, but it has not been proved,³ and the lack of evidence is supplied by more general notions of prophecy.⁴ The idea that Hosea was active in Israel in the eighth century is based on the superscription to the book

1. There are some variations on this theme but H. W. Wolff (*Hosea*, pp. xxiii–xxvii) is representative.

2. The tendency to historicize interpretation is evident in the otherwise perceptive commentary by Mays (1969) but is resisted by Andersen-Freedman (1980).

3. Good (1966, p. 24) adverts to the problem and proposes some criteria of oral tradition but admits their inconclusiveness and, ultimately, is reduced to bare assumption.

4. Some of these theories are very interesting (for instance, Wilson, 1980, pp. 226–31), but they still assume rather than prove that the book originated in prophetic ministry and that it was not composed as a literary work but as a collection of impromptu sayings.

(1:1), even though this is considered to be editorial and interpretative,⁵ but it really depends on the assumption that historical references are contemporary with the historical events that prompt them.⁶ The idea that Hosea had disciples, or that his work went through several editions, should be susceptible to verification, but it functions as a logical fiction that is used to explain how early oral material could be recorded, transmitted and preserved as literature.⁷ All the ideas interlock so that it becomes as impossible to question the theory as it is to prove it.

The theory, however, can be reformulated to agree with the literary and historical evidence. The idea, in these terms, is that Hosea composed his prophecy and that someone else rewrote it. The evidence is the structure and organization of the book, its language and style, its sources and their interpretations, and its function in the history of Israelite literature. The argument is that each of these elements is distinct in each version, that the second version preserved the original by imitating and adapting all the details of its composition, and that the two versions are combined continuously, deliberately, and systematically as text and running commentary. The advantage of the proposition is merely its simplicity and verifiability, its exclusion of other assumptions to be considered in their own right, the fact that any reader of Hosea can judge whether or not the theory explains the text and its supported by the literary evidence.

I. Structure and Organization

The book of Hosea can be analyzed as a literary and poetic composition. It is composed of stanzas, strophes, tableaux and triptychs. Stanzas are sentences distributed in lines by cadence and pause. Strophes are formal and thematic arrangements of stanzas. Tableaux are concatenations of strophes in logical, descriptive and narrative patterns. Triptychs are sets of tableaux hinged by repetition and recurrence. The revision of

5. So Wolff (1965), Rudolph (1966), Van Leeuwen (1968), Mays (1969), Andersen-Freedman (1980), although each one isolates elements that supposedly are literal and factual.

6. The grossest historicism is manifested in Wolff's commentary where kerygmatic units acquire a certain significance by being assigned to discrete and totally imaginary historical situations. Childs (1979, pp. 373-384) works with the same assumptions and arrives at the same general conclusions, but he attributes a dogmatic status to this illusory congruence of literary and historical events by arguing that revelation and the canonical process coincide.

7. The notion of disciple is especially crucial in the narrative section (Hos 1-3) that combines biographical and autobiographical versions of the same story. It is an obvious case of the historicist tendency to imagine a real situation for every literary form and a separate reality for every interpretation.

the book was not haphazard editing but a detailed literary rewriting that consisted in changing some stanzas and adding others, in modifying strophes, and remodeling tableaux, in emphasizing the separation between triptychs, and giving different interpretations to each. The original was staccato and not easy to follow. The rewriting introduced conceptual clarity but it made the original transitions amazingly obscure.

The structure and organization involve all levels of composition from elementary grammar and syntax and poetics to the evident sophistication of tableaux and triptychs.

Tableaux often coincide with chapters in the printed Bible and are simply graphic or dramatic collections of images, ideas, and individuals in a single scene. Triptychs—literally, sets of three writing boards bound by hinges—are sets of three tableaux bound by patterns of repetition. The evidence for such deliberate and systematic composition is most obvious in the first three chapters and it is clear that they were written as a preface and paradigm for the rest of the work.

The first triptych comprises Hosea's prophecy and its later interpretation. Each has a different structure and organization but it is clear that the revised version recognized the original arrangement and deliberately changed it. (Fig. 1) In Hosea's version the first tableau narrates Yahweh's marriage with the land, the second explains their divorce, and the third portrays their reconciliation. The revision consisted in adding a different conclusion to both the first and third tableaux, in inserting whatever antecedent adjustments these required, and in smoothing the transition from the revised first tableau to the second. This version concentrates on the children of the marriage and anticipates their return to the land and the establishment of a theocracy. It substitutes logical progression for the original dramatic development and reiteration for symbolic transformation.

Tableaux in both versions are composed in a narrative (A-A', B-B', . . .) or descriptive (A-B, A'-B', . . .) or explanatory (A-B-[C]-B-A) order. In Hosea's version the first and third tableaux are in narrative order (A-A'), each with two strophes that complement each other and combine to tell a continuous story in proper chronological or dramatic sequence: the first proceeds from Yahweh's marriage with the land to the birth of the children in a crescendo that obliterates first the house of Jehu, then the northern kingdom, and finally the people; the third recounts Yahweh's reconciliation with the land and their happy reunion with the children. The second tableau, however, is composed in an explanatory order that begins by presenting the case against the land (A-B-C) and continues in inverse order with an explanation of the facts

FIGURE 1 The First Triptych

Tableau 1		Tableau 2		Tableau 3	
Hosea	Book of Hosea	Hosea	Book of Hosea	Hosea	Book of Hosea
	1:1	2:4	2:3-4	2:18-19	
1:2	—	2:5	—	2:20a	
	—	—	—	2:21-22	2:20b-22
1:3-4	—	2:6-7a	—	—	—
—	1:5	2:7b	—	2:23-24	
	—	—	—	2:25	
1:6	—	2:8	—	—	—
	1:7	2:9	—		3:1
	—	—	—		3:2-3
1:8-9	—	2:10	—		—
—	—	2:11	—		3:4
	2:1	—	—		3:5
	2:2	2:12	—		—
	—	2:13	—		—
	—	—	—		—
	—	2:14	—		—
	—	2:15	—		—
	—	2:16-17	—		—
	—	—	—		—

and their consequences (C'-B'-A'): the case opens with the accusation of adultery (A = 2:4-5), continues by citing the land's carousals and the birth of the illegitimate children as evidence (B = 2:6-7), and concludes with the decision in favor of divorce (C = 2:8-9); the review argues that the divorce will bring the land to its senses (C' = 2:10-11), put an end to its carousals (B' = 2:12-13), and restore its fidelity to Yahweh (A' = 2:14-17).

The revised version is concerned with issues of war (1:5, 7; 2:2, 20b) and government (1:1; 2:1-2; 3:1-5). Its argument is perfectly clear but it is extraneous to Hosea's metaphor and tends to confuse or contradict it. In the first tableau its additions dissolve the original narrative development and substitute an explanatory order instead (A-B-B'-A'): the first strophe (A = 1:1-2) includes a duplicate introduction (1:1) that mentions Israel and Judah and their ruling houses, and the last strophe corresponds to it by mentioning them again under one rule (A' = 1:8-2:2); the second strophe (B = 1:3-5) describes the destruction of Israel's weapons, and the third matches it by declaring that Yahweh will save

Judah without weapons ($B' = 1:6-7$). The second tableau was unchanged except for the addition of two lines to the first stanza (2:3 "Say to your brothers 'My People' / and to your sisters 'Pitied'") that repeat elements from the stanza's original antecedent (1:8-9 "Not Pitied," "Not my People") and ease the transition from its own intervening remarks. The third tableau was modified to agree with the new perspective on war (2:20b) and was changed into the descriptive pattern ($A-B$, $A'-B'$) by appending two strophes that duplicate and interpret Hosea's strophes and effectively suppress the original metaphor of Yahweh's marriage with the land.

Tableaux are distinguished by their subject matter. They have beginnings and ends, and the boundaries between them consist in the exhaustion of one subject and the transition to the next. But the beginnings and ends and the different phases in tableaux are clearly marked by different types of repetition. The first tableau in Hosea's version, for instance, is composed of two strophes that are pretty well formal duplicates: most of the clauses are consecutive; the stanzas have exactly the same pattern of main and subordinate clauses; the strophes both end with the birth of a son and two consecutive reasons for his symbolic name. The last tableau, similarly, has two strophes that begin with the same formula (*wēhāyāh bayyôm hahû²*) and share the same interest in heaven and earth and natural cycles. The central tableau is different and matches all its strophes with verbatim repetitions: the first and last ($A-A'$) contrast the land with the wilderness; the second and fifth ($B-B'$) mention its lovers; the third and fourth ($C-C'$) describe a reversal (*šwb*); the whole second part ($C'-B'-A'$) is composed by repeating key elements from the first (compare, for example, 2:7 with 2:11, 12, 14, 15).

Triptychs resolve particular issues and like tableaux are distinguished by the correspondences between their introductions and their conclusions. This is most obvious in the revised version that ends with another wedding like the first (1:2-9; 3:1-3) and with a repeated and more explicit understanding of the reunification of Israel and Judah (2:1-2; 3:4-5). But it is just as clear in the original version where the land is restored as the bride of Yahweh (1:2; 2:18-19, 20a, 21-22) and all their children are reunited (1:3-4, 6, 8-9; 2:23-25). The issues in each version are different and each is resolved in a different way: Hosea dramatizes Yahweh's involvement in the life of the people; the book describes the institutions of its survival.

The second triptych (4:1-6:11) has analogous interlocking structures (Fig. 2). It is differentiated from the first by its internal design and by the issue that it raises and resolves, but it is also distinguished from the

FIGURE 2 The Second Triptych

Tableau 1		Tableau 2		Tableau 3	
Hosea	Book of Hosea	Hosea	Book of Hosea	Hosea	Book of Hosea
4:1			5:1a α	5:11-12	
4:2-3*	4:2-3		5:1a β b-2	5:13a	
—	—		—	5:13b-14a	
	4:4-5	5:3		—	—
	4:6	5:4		5:14b-15	
	—	—		6:1-2	
4:7-8			5:5	6:3	
	4:9	5:6a		—	—
	—	5:6b-7		6:4	
4:10	4:10-11	—	—	6:5-6	
—			5:8	—	—
4:12			5:9		6:7-8
4:13a	4:13		5:10		6:9
—	—		—		6:10-11
	4:14				—
	4:15				
4:16	—				
4:17-19	—				
—	—				

preceding triptych by a formal introductory summary that restates its principal relevant points (4:1-3). In the first triptych Yahweh spoke to Hosea (1:1-2), and in the second Hosea reports to the people what Yahweh said (4:1a). The first recorded Yahweh's dispute with the land (2:4), and the summary introduces his dispute with the inhabitants of the land (4:1ba). The first looked forward to a time of fidelity and truth and knowledge of God (2:21) and the introduction complains that all of these are presently missing (4:1b). The first triptych mentioned the beasts of the field and the birds of the air and the reptiles (2:20), and the transition mentions some of these and the fish in the sea (4:3). The first attributed the end of the dynasty of Jehu to his murderous coup (1:4) and the summary associates murder with the lack of the knowledge of God (4:2b). The first described the failure of crops and the abandonment of the land (2:11) and the introductory summary repeats that the land is desolate (4:3). There are only two elements in the introduction that do not resume elements from the first triptych and these have a specific

proleptic function: Hosea notes that oaths and lies abound (4:2) and both of these anticipate developments in the third triptych (cp. 7:1, 13; 9:2; 10:4); the book identified lack of knowledge of God with ignorance of the decalogue (4:2 murder, theft, adultery) and all of these are crimes that are attributed to the priests in this triptych and the next (cf. 4:6, 13b, 14; 6:7–11; 7:15).

In Hosea's version the issue is the repentance of the people and its failure to divert the impending calamity. Its boundaries are marked by referring explicitly to Hosea's prophetic mission at the beginning and the end (4:1; 6:5–6) and by repeating at the end of the triptych all the accusations that were made at the beginning concerning the lack of truth and knowledge (4:1, 2a α b, 3; 6:4–6). In the revised version the issue is the responsibility of the priesthood in misleading the people (4:4–6, 9, 13b–15), in supporting the monarchy (5:1–2, 5, 8–10), and promoting violence (6:7–11): its boundaries are deliberately marked by mentioning the priests and their involvement in murder at the beginning (4:2a β , 4–6) where it could be considered pertinent, and at the end (6:7–11) where it is artificial and totally incongruous.

The first tableau in Hosea's version is composed of four strophes in an explanatory order that formulates the accusation against Israel (A = 4:1, 2a α b, 3) and describes the punishment (B = 4:7–8, 10), and then assembles the evidence (B' = 4:12–13a) and reformulates the charge (A' = 4:16–19). The second tableau describes successive stages in a pilgrimage and has two matching strophes that portray an unclean people ignorant of Yahweh and truly unrepentant (A = 5:3–4) pretending to repent and being abandoned by Yahweh to their own devices (A' = 5:6–7). The third tableau has an explanatory structure (A–B–A') that describes the situation in which Israel might have repented (A = 5:11–14a), the pilgrimage and repentance that was expected (B = 5:14b–6:3), and what actually happened in that situation (6:4–6). Together they describe a sinful nation that repented for the wrong reasons, in the wrong way, to the wrong God.

The revision took place by adding words, lines, stanzas and strophes that reorganized the tableaux and changed the structure of the triptych. In the first tableau two strophes were added in the same relative position to preserve the explanatory structure (i.e., A–[X]–B–B–[X']–A) while diverting attention from the people to the priest (X = 4:4–6) and his family (X' = 4:14–15): it interprets the mother of the first triptych as the mother of the priest (4:5; cp. 2:4, 7a) and treats the unfaithful wife as his daughter-in-law (4:13b, 14; cp. 2:4b; 3:1–3). In the second tableau the original was enclosed by two strophes implicating the priests and the

kings (X-A-A'-X'): they changed the original concern for Ephraim into a criticism of all the tribes (5:9) and required a corresponding change in the original complaint (5:5). The third tableau was changed by the addition of a concluding strophe (B' = 6:7-11) that interpreted the expected pilgrimage and repentance (B = 5:14b-6:3) as a pilgrimage by both Israel and Judah to Shechem under the guidance of unscrupulous priests. Together the tableaux shift the blame from the people to the institutions the book is eager to reform.

The third triptych (Fig. 3) also begins with a resumptive introduction. In Hosea's version it summarizes the basic point of the preceding triptych by referring to Yahweh's attempt to heal Israel (7:1 *rp*²; cp. 5:13; 6:1) and by recalling the crimes that kept Israel from repenting (7:2 *ma'alêlêhem*, cp. 5:4), and it introduces as the issue to be discussed in the rest of the triptych the lies and deceitfulness of Samaria that Yahweh has uncovered (7:1a, 2). In the revised version the cross-reference consists in recalling the thievery of the priests (7:1b *gnb*, *gdd*; cp. 4:2; 6:9), and the introduction is an extended metaphor that ridicules the kings (7:3-7) and begins this version's incessant diatribe against the monarchy.

The last triptych (Fig. 4) has the same sort of introductory summary that links it to what precedes and sets the tone for what is to follow. In Hosea's version the summary repeats that Yahweh might have healed Israel (11:3; cp. 7:1) except that Israel was involved in offering sacrifice to idols (11:2; cp. 8:11-13; 9:4) and persisted in making alliances with Egypt and Assyria (11:1-2; cp. 7:11; 8:9, 13; 9:3). The introduction is the story of Israel from childhood to maturity (11:1-5) that prepares for the following stories of Jacob and Ephraim from birth to death. In the revised version there is an added cross-reference to Israel's defeat in battle (11:6; cp. 10:13-15) and reliance on useless idols (*lô' ʿāl*, 7:16; 11:7) but the new introduction consists in affirming that Yahweh is God (11:8-9) and in foretelling the nation's return from exile (11:10-11). The two have opposite perspectives, Hosea insisting that Israel will not go back to Egypt but will suffer exile and die in Assyria, the author of the book protesting that Israel will survive and return to Yahweh.

The four triptychs are distinct and self-contained, related to each other in sequence by their introductory summaries, and arranged together in a comprehensive argumentative pattern (A-B-B'-A'). In both versions the first triptych is paradigmatic, covers the entire story from beginning to end, and introduces all the elements to be developed in the sequel. Hosea begins with Yahweh, the land, and their children, spends the second and third triptychs exploring the rituals associated with fertility and the loss of the land, and ends with the parent-child relation-

FIGURE 3 The Third Triptych

Tableau 1		Tableau 2		Tableau 3	
Hosea	Book of Hosea	Hosea	Book of Hosea	Hosea	Book of Hosea
7:1a	7:1	9:1		10:1	
7:2		9:2-3		10:2	
—	7:3-4	9:4	—	—	10:3
	7:5-6	9:5-6		10:4	
	7:7	—	—	10:5	
	—	9:7a		—	—
7:8-9		9:7b-8		10:6	
	7:10	—	9:9		10:7-8αα
7:11-12		—	—	10:8aβb	
—	—	9:10a	9:10	—	—
7:13		9:11-12			10:9
7:14		—	—		10:10
—	—	9:13			—
	7:15	9:14		10:11	
	7:16	—		10:12	
	—	9:15	—	—	—
8:1		9:16			10:13
8:2-3		9:17			10:14
—	8:4	—	—		10:15
	—				—
	8:5				
	8:6				
	—				
8:7					
8:8-9					
—	8:10				
	—				
8:11-12					
8:13					
—	8:14				
	—				

ship between Yahweh and Israel. The book begins with the return from exile and the creation of a theocratic state, spends the second and third triptychs eliminating rival priestly and monarchic forms of government, and ends with the nation's return from exile and total allegiance to Yahweh.

FIGURE 4 The Fourth Triptych

Tableau 1		Tableau 2		Tableau 3	
Hosea	Book of Hosea	Hosea	Book of Hosea	Hosea	Book of Hosea
11:1-2		12:1		13:1	
11:3		12:2		13:2aαb	13:2
—	—	12:3		—	—
11:4		—	—	13:3	
11:5		12:4-5		13:4	
—	—		12:6-7	—	—
	11:6-7	12:8-9		13:5-6	
	11:8	—	—	13:7-8	
	11:9	12:10		—	—
	—	12:11			13:9-10a
	11:10	—	12:12		13:10b-11
	11:11	—	—		—
	—	12:13-14		13:12-13	
		12:15		13:14	
		—	—	—	—
					13:15
					14:1
					—
					14:2-3a
					14:3b
					14:4
					—
					14:5
					14:6-7
					14:8
					—
					14:9
					14:10
					—

II. *Language and Style*

Hosea's language is personal and concrete, his style is vivid and dramatic and both vary from triptych to triptych. The book attempts to imitate his work, and inserts its comments by redoing his lines, but its language is more stilted and abstract, its sense of drama often overwhelmed by bombast.

In the first triptych the characters are Yahweh, Hosea, the woman and the children. In the first tableau Yahweh speaks to Hosea who narrates

the story and mimes the action. In the second tableau Yahweh speaks to the children about his wife (2:4–5), to Hosea about his wife and children (2:6–7), to his wife directly, and indirectly, and with a quotation of her response (2:8–9), and then in a monologue about his wife in past (2:10–11), present (2:12–13), and future tense (2:14–17). In the third tableau Yahweh speaks to the woman, first in personal terms (2:18–22), and then in the discourse of heaven and earth (2:18–25). The action takes place at three different times, in the beginning in the first tableau (1:2), in the present in the second (2:4), and in the future in the third (2:18). The stanzas are held together mainly by the repetition of words in the first tableau (e.g., 1:2 *yhwh bēhōšē^c / yhwh ʔel hōšēa^c; zēnûnîm . . . zēnûnîm / zānōh tizneh*), by rhyme in the second tableau (e.g., 2:7 -ah, -ah, -ê/- ay, -ê/-ay, -î/-î/-î/-ay), and by rhyme and the repetition of words in the third (e.g., 2:18–19). The words are taken from the realm of family relationships, agriculture, ritual, and judicial procedure, and signify mainly physical and personal activities. The entire triptych unfolds the single lavish metaphor of marriage from its symbolic past to its final consummation.

The revised version made its changes by catchword (1:1; 1:5; 1:7; 2:1; 2:3) and cross-reference (2:1; 2:17aβ; 2:20b; 3:1–5). Catchword consists in repeating one or more words of the original text in a different or opposite context, cross-reference consists in obvious and inconsequential references to the revised text. The new introduction to the book (1:1) begins with a formula that repeats in abstract terms the fact that Yahweh spoke to Hosea (*dbr YHWH*, cp. 1:2) but it substitutes two kingdoms for the land that Yahweh married and a precise chronology for Hosea's primordial past (1:2). The first time it talks about war (1:5) it repeats Hosea's references to Israel and Jezreel (1:3–4) but it omits his mention of Jehu and the northern kingdom and inserts a reference to the valley of Jezreel; the second time (1:7), it contradicts Hosea's claim that Yahweh will not have mercy (1:6), and adds a cross-reference to its own inclusion of Judah (1:1); the third time (2:20b) it simply summarizes the others. The first reference to the return from exile (2:1–2) contradicts the saying "Not my people," refers again to Israel and Judah (cf. 1:1, 7), repeats the first part of its formula "And it will happen on that day" (cf. 1:5), and becomes plausible in the context by an incongruous reference to Jezreel (2:2 = 1:5) and the other two children (2:3 = 1:6, 8–9). Its contrast between the ancient debacle in the *valley* of Achor and hope for the future (2:17aβ) has no basis in the immediate context but depends on a cross-reference to its own earlier reference to the *valley* of Jezreel (1:5). The duplicate marriage (3:1–5) returns to the beginning of the first

tableau where Yahweh spoke to Hosea (1:2) and describes the sort of dickering that went on in dealing with prostitutes (3:2–3; cp. 1:2). The editorializing is artificial and obvious but it gives the finished text consistency and, by sheer insistence, makes contrary statements seem right.

The additions generally mimic the original dialogue sequence but they tend to be vague and abstract interruptions that contribute little to the dramatic action. The introduction, for instance, uses substantives and clichés (1:1 “The word of Yahweh . . . that occurred to Hosea . . .”) instead of the concrete and direct diction favored by Hosea (1:2 “ . . . Yahweh spoke to Hosea, and Yahweh said to Hosea . . .”). Hosea refers to the imminent punishment of specific crimes of Jehu (1:4 “In a little while I will punish the house of Jehu for the blood shed at Jezreel”) but the book is vague about the time and omits the specific culprit and the crime (1:5 “On that day I will break the bow of Israel in the valley of Jezreel”). The interpolation that exempts Judah from the abrogation of the covenant (1:7) maintains the dialogue pattern by continuing as a speech of Yahweh, but it is not addressed to Hosea or to any one in particular, refers to Yahweh in the third person, and interrupts the cycle of births to list the implements of war. The first decree of restoration (2:1–2) is expressed mostly in the passive voice and reflects on the drama without contributing to it. An abrupt reference to the valley of Achor (2:17aβ) creates a hiatus between Yahweh wooing the land and the land’s response and interrupts a physical relationship with talk of history and hope. The duplicate marriage (3:1–5) contains a mixture of concrete detail and theological speculation but it comes at the end of the action and just summarizes the point of the revision.

Hosea continues his dramatic style in the second triptych but abandons the narrative mode for dialogue and soliloquy. The revised version recognizes the pattern of dialogue and soliloquy (4:9, 11, 14b) but changes the plot and neglects the drama. Hosea’s text has some literal repetition (cf. 4:1 *YHWH* / *laYHWH*, *hāʾāreš* / *bāʾāreš*; 4:16 *sorērāh* / *sārār*) and a little final rhyme (e.g., 5:4a *-ēhem* / *-ēhem*) but it relies mainly on interlinear assonance and alliteration. This affects two or three lines at a time and in any stanza can be combined with lines that are unique or blank. For instance, in the second stanza (4:3) the first two lines repeat the same or similar sounds in the middle of the first and at the beginning of the second line (*teʾēbal* / *wēʾumlal*), but the third line has a different sort of assonance (*bēḥayyat haššādeh* . . .) and the fourth is marked by alliteration (*wēqam dēgē* . . .). The revised version copies the original and uses all four techniques: the first stanza in the diatribe

against the priests is filled with repetition (4:4-5); a stanza at the end of the second tableau has final rhyme, interlinear alliteration, and a final blank line (*tiq'û šôpār baggib'āh / ḥăṣṣērāh bārāmāh / hārî'û bêt 'āwen / 'ahārêkâ binyāmîn*). On this point, then, the revised version is almost, and deliberately, indistinguishable from the original.

In the third triptych in Hosea's version the prophet himself assumes a leading role, most notably when he defends his mission (9:7-8) and intervenes to demand redress (9:14, 17). His stanzas acquire their artistic cohesion less from rhyme and assonance and alliteration than from the literary effect of syllogistic reasoning and the constant deployment of proper names, pronouns and pronominal suffixes. Proper names accumulate or are repeated in the same stanza (7:1a, 8-9, 11-12; 8:2-3; 9:13; 10:11). Verbal clauses have expressed pronominal subjects (7:8-9, 13; 10:2; 10:11) and lines are related and arguments are reinforced by repeated pronominal suffixes (7:2, 12, 13, 14; 8:11, 13; 9:11-12, 14; 10:1, 2). The syllogistic reasoning—a sort of sorites or inference drawn from a concatenation of images and events⁸—is directed to proving that nothing is as it appears, and all the language has to do with lies and deception in worship and politics, agriculture and human relations. The revised version carefully imitated these mannerisms,⁹ but it tried to show that all these evils could be traced to the kings who inaugurated and encouraged the worship of the calves at Bethel. It is not interested in the covenant or fertility but in the official cult and its promoters. At first it keeps to Hosea's sense that things are not what they should be, but it leaves his idyllic realm of natural commonplace occurrence for urban courtly existence and the world of institutions. Soon, however, it drops the pretense and inserts clear and incisive commentaries.

These are lines added to stanzas (7:1b; 9:10b), or stanzas inserted in strophes (7:10; 8:4; 8:10; 8:14; 9:9; 9:15; 10:3; 10:7-8a), or entire strophes interpolated into tableaux (7:3-7; 7:15-16; 8:5-6; 10:9-10; 10:13-15), and in each case they are justified by repetition or cross-reference. The repetitions are literal and contrary: Yahweh remembered the evil of Samaria (7:2 *rā'ātām*) but this version refers to the evil of the priests (7:3 *rā'ātām*); Israel claimed it knew Yahweh but it rejected the good

8. Cf. Andersen-Freedman, 1980, p. 496. Examples include 7:8-9; 7:11-12; 8:7; 8:11-12; 9:4; 9:5-6; 9:7b-8; 10:12. The same style is imitated in the revised version: 7:3-7; 7:15-16; 8:6; 10:13.

9. It follows Hosea in its reliance on pronominal subjects in verbal clauses (7:6, 15; 8:4, 6; 9:10), in its use of pronominal suffixes to mark the progress of an argument (7:3-7; 8:4) or as a substitute for consecutive sequence (8:6; 9:10b, 15; 10:3, 15), and its excesses are sometimes confusing (7:5; 8:5, 14).

(8:2–3 *yd^c, znḥ*), but in this version Yahweh claims not to know the kings and rejects the idols of Samaria (8:4, 5 *yd^c, znḥ*); Ephraim hired lovers (8:8–9 *hiinû*) but this version dismisses the point (8:10 *gam kî yitnû*); Israel was punished for its rituals (9:7a *pqd*), but the book recalls what happened at Gibeah (9:9 *pqd*); Hosea envisaged the nation with its hand to the plow looking forward to a new crop of righteousness (10:11–12 *hrš, qsr*), but the revised version uses the same words to condemn them for their reliance on arms (10:13 *hrš, qsr*). The cross-references are intrusive and recall the book's general line of argument: the crimes of Samaria are glossed by reference to the crimes of the priests (7:1b = 4:2aβ + 6:9); foreign alliances are nothing compared to the pretensions of the monarchy (7:10 = 5:5); half-hearted repentance is not as bad as the deviousness of the court (7:16 *qeset*, cp. 1:5, 7; 2:20b); Israel made idols and forgot the God who made them (8:14 *šh*; cp. 8:6); all the evil of the priests began at Gilgal (9:15 *rā'āiām*; cp. 7:3); in the end they reject the king they tried to please (10:3; cp. 7:3). All the new material is fitted in carefully as the book hammers home its point.

In the final triptych Hosea returns to the narrative mode of the first. The plot does not hinge on careful and detailed argumentation but is stated openly and revolves around stories about famous people in the past. The characters are Yahweh, Hosea, and the children. The topics are mostly those that have already been introduced in the earlier triptychs. The techniques include repetition of words and rhyme, assonance and alliteration, and pleonastic pronouns. The entire triptych is designed to resume the others and bring the prophecy to a successful conclusion.

The revision appreciated Hosea's work, completely changed it and was careful to make its revisions both obvious and compatible with the original. His prophecy was vivid and dramatic and soon out-of-date. The revision was clear and authentic and seemed to ring true. Their movement *pari passu* is the meaning of the book.

III. Sources and Interpretation

The different language, style, structure and organization in the two versions can be traced not only to different times and writers but to different inspirations. The book treats Hosea's prophecy with respect and cites authorities to justify the radical changes that it makes: it demonstrates a certain familiarity with Amos and Ezekiel but it is compacted mainly of quotations from Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic history. Hosea, similarly, created an original literary work but quoted contemporary historians (J, the first Deuteronomist, P and E) and alluded to the earlier prophets (Isaiah and Amos) to give his writings substance and credibility.

Quotations and allusions are facets of literary tradition. Quotations consist of one or more words that are anomalous in their present context and are repeated in an opposite order or a contrary sense from another text¹⁰ that explains them and the present context, and is quoted again or alluded to elsewhere in the present text. Allusions are groups of one or more words that are distributed in their present context but are peculiar to another context where they are combined and explained. Both imply an acknowledged dependence on predecessors and precedents and a determination to preserve and further their work. Concretely, they imply that Hosea had read the sources and wrote for an audience that would be familiar with them, and that the author of the book related his prophecy to recorded events to reconcile it with a proper understanding of history.¹¹

The first triptych in Hosea's version was composed with reference to historical texts on the covenant, the wilderness wanderings and the occupation of the land. The revised version used some of the same texts but introduced notions derived from Deuteronomistic legal and patriarchal traditions.

In the first tableau the anomaly is in the names of the children that are interpreted symbolically and, in contrast to the names of their mother and father, are filled with foreboding. They are all taken from other narrative contexts to which Hosea alludes later and in which they have a literal meaning that explains their symbolism in the present context: (1) Jezreel is the name of the place where Jehu assassinated Joram and Ahaziah (1:4; II Kings 9). In the early Deuteronomistic version of this story Jehu was a usurper whose coup destroyed the alliance between Israel and Judah and led to the wars that were settled by foreign alliances and that ended with the fall of Samaria and the Assyrian siege of Jerusalem.¹² Hosea understood it in the same way as the beginning of the end for the kingdom of Israel (1:4), and as a timely warning to Judah (5:11–12; 12:1–3). He gave the name a negative connotation that it did not have in the source, but he returned to it later to explain its original positive symbolic sense (2:24–25); he alluded to his interpretation again in announcing Yahweh's case against the people (1:4 *dēmē*,

10. This is "Seidel's Law" elaborated most recently by Beentjes (1982).

11. Quotations and allusions, from this perspective, are indicative of education and culture. In Fishbane's perspective (1985), on the other hand, inner-biblical interpretation is evidence for the existence and transmission of an original, complete, and authoritative tradition in the community that it created.

12. The analysis of sources is based on Peckham (1985). In the later version, by contrast, the alliance brought Judah into contact with the dreaded house of Ahab, and Jehu was considered an inspired leader designated by God to combat the cult of Baal.

4:2 *dāmîm*); (2) The name “Unpitied” (1:6) is taken from the prologue to the J covenant on Sinai where Yahweh declares that he is the God of pity (Exod 34:6). Hosea immediately quotes again from the same text in which Yahweh declared that he is forgiving (Exod 34:7) to insist that Yahweh will not forgive the northern kingdom (1:6). The quotations contradict the source text but they are confirmed by Hosea’s repeated allusions to the J covenant of mercy and fidelity (Exod 34:6–7 *rḥm, ḥsd, ʾmt*, cf. Hos 2:21–22, 25; 4:1; 6:4–6), as well as to the crimes that undermine it (Exod 34:7 *ʾāwon, pešaʿ, ḥaṭṭaʾt*; cf. Hos 4:7–8; 7:1a, 13; 8:11, 13; 13:12–13) and to the threats of punishment that protect it (Exod 34:6 *pqd*, cf. Hos 8:13; 9:7; 13:3); (3) The name “Not My People” and its corollary that Yahweh is not “Ehyeh” (1:8–9) is a quotation from the E commentary on the same text (Exod 3:9–14, 15b): in the original J version Yahweh declared that his name was “Yahweh, Yahweh” (Exod 34:6); in E’s version Moses is supposed to tell the people (Exod 3:10 “My People” [*ʾammî*]) that his name is “Ehyeh, Ehyeh” (Exod 3:14). The quotation contradicts the source but it is confirmed by Hosea’s allusion to the name “God” that the source uses (2:25 “And [my people] will say ‘My God’; cp. Exod 3:9–14, 15b), and by a quotation from the correlative prohibition in E against using the name of any other God (Hos 2:18–19; cp. Exod 23:13).

The names of the three children signify the end of the Northern Kingdom and the abrogation of the covenant with Yahweh. In the third tableau, consequently, when Hosea describes the eventual restoration of Israel, he has to appeal to a different covenant. He continues to draw on the language of J (2:20 *krt brt*; cp. Exod 34:10, 27), but the terms of the restored covenant are taken from the Priestly version of the covenant with Noah (Gen 9:1, 9–17). This is the eternal covenant (2:21a *lě ʾôlām*; Gen 9:16 *bērît ʾôlām*) that God made with Noah and his descendants, with the birds, and the animals, and all living things on the earth (2:20a; Gen 9:9–10). It is anomalous, however, in the present context of courtship and marriage (2:18–19, 20a, 21–22), and the quotation reverses the order of creatures in P (Gen 9:10 has “birds, cattle . . .”; Hosea has “cattle, birds . . .”) and follows the order and terminology of J (2:20 *ḥayyat ḥaššādeh, ʾôp ḥaššamāyim, remeš hāʾādāmāh*; cp. Gen 2:19a; 6:7a) rather than the language of P in describing them (Gen 9:9–10 *ʾôp, bēhēmāh, ḥayyat hāʾāreš*; cp. Gen 1:26). The quotation is confirmed at the beginning of the second triptych when Hosea repeats part of the list (4:3aβ) and includes the fish of the sea that P mentions and J ignores (4:3b *dēgē ḥayyām*; cp. Gen 1:26 *dēgat ḥayyām*). It is also supported in Hosea’s opening words that allude to the Priestly account of creation

(1:2 *tēhillat dibber-YHWH*; cp. Gen 1:1), and in the next strophe when Hosea refers to its order of created things (2:23–25 heaven, earth, seed = Gen 1:1–12).

The second tableau alludes to the combined J and P stories of rebellion in the wilderness (Exod 16; Num 16; 20:2–13). The wife is mother earth who thought that her lovers gave her food and water to drink (2:7b *lahmî ûmêmay . . . wēšiqqûyāy*) and who was destined to die of thirst in the wilderness (2:5b *kammidbar . . . wahāmittihā baššāmā*³). In every instance of rebellion in the wilderness the people fear that they will die in the wilderness, but in the J version Dathan and Abiram accuse Moses of bringing them into the wilderness to kill them (Num 16:13 *lahāmītēnû bammidbār*; cp. Exod 16:3; Num 20:4): in the story of the manna the people have no food (Exod 16:3 *leḥem*), and in the story of rebellion at Meribah they have no water (Num 20:5 *mayim*), and Moses is supposed to give them water to drink from the rock (Num 20:8 *mēmāyw . . . wēhišqītā*). The allusions are supported by quotations from the same sources later in Hosea's text: the reconciliation between Yahweh and his wife takes place on a journey through the wilderness and includes, surprisingly enough, giving her "vineyards from there" (2:17a)—contradicting Dathan and Abiram's complaint in the wilderness that Moses had not given them vineyards (Num 16:14); in the P story of the manna a constant theme is having enough to eat (Exod 16:3, 8, 12 *kl + šb*^c), and later in the fourth triptych Hosea again refers to the time in the wilderness when Yahweh fed the people and they had enough to eat (13:5–6 *šb*^c).

In the same tableau Hosea mentions the clothing that Yahweh gave his wife (2:7b, 11b), the oil that she needed (2:7b), and the silver and gold that she used for Baal (2:10b). But he also includes the "grain, wine and oil" (2:10; cp. 2:11; 7:14; 9:1–2) and the vines and olive trees that she thought were gifts from her lovers (2:14). These are not particularly appropriate gifts for a woman but are the typical produce of a fertile land (Deut 6:11; 11:14; II Kings 18:31–32) and are an allusion to the early Deuteronomistic decree of centralization according to which the tithes of "grain, wine and oil" were to be offered to Yahweh in Jerusalem (Deut 12:17). Hosea quotes from the same decree later when he criticizes the people for eating meat (8:13 *bāsār + kl*; cp. Deut 12:20 *kl + bāsār*) and for maintaining their local festivals instead of worshipping Yahweh in Jerusalem (9:1 *šmḥ, dgn, trš*; cp. Deut 12:17–18 *dgn, trš, šmḥ*).

The revised version alludes to some of the same texts but expresses itself in Deuteronomistic phraseology: when Hosea mentions Jehu in Jezreel this author mentions the bow that Jehu used to kill Joram and

Ahaziah (1:5 *qešet*; cp. II Kgs 9:24) but uses the Deuteronomistic expression “valley of Jezreel” (1:5; cp. Josh 17:16; Judg 6:33); when Hosea quotes from the early history of Moses in Midian the revised version quotes a saying of Pharaoh from the same story (2:2aβ *wē^cālū min hā^oāreš* = Exod 1:10bβ *wē^cālāh min hā^oāreš*), but instead of quoting what Pharaoh also said about the large number of Israelites (Exod 1:9b–10a) it alludes to the typical patriarchal promises formulated by the Deuteronomist (2:1 “like the sand of the sea,” cf. Gen 22:17; 32:13, etc.). In other instances it simply relies on its system of cross-referencing to inject illustrations such as the crime of Achan (2:17aβ), or information such as the synchronism of the kings (1:1), that it knew from the Deuteronomistic history.

Its quotations are signalled in the usual way but its language is typically Deuteronomistic. At the end of the first tableau the revised version quotes from the book of Ezekiel to describe the restoration (2:2; Ezek 37:21–22): it is anomalous in a text that predicts the destruction of the nation; it involves Judah and Israel (2:2aα; cp. Ezek 37:15) and consists in gathering the people of Israel together, but the quotation inverts the order of the original text (*qbš + bēnē yiśrā^oēl*, 2:2aα; cp. Ezek 37:21); it signifies the reunification of Judah and Israel as one nation under one king (Ezek 37:22), but since the book is leary of kings it prefers the title “leader” and expresses itself in the official Deuteronomistic terminology for the installation of kings (2:2aβ *wēšāmū lāhem ro^oš ^oehād*; cp. Deut 17:14, 15; I Sam 8:5); the quotation is confirmed at the end of the third tableau when the book alludes to Ezekiel again and mentions specifically that this leader is the Davidic king (3:5; cp. Ezek 37:24–25). Toward the end of the third tableau the revised version quotes the Decalogue’s stipulations against adultery and covetousness: it is anomalous since it is quoted as a divine command (3:1a); it is quoted as usual in opposite order (3:1a *ʔiššāh . . . rē^c . . . ūmēnā^oāpet*; cp. Deut 5:18+21 *wēlo^o tin^oāp . . . wēlo^o taḥmod ^oēšet rē^cekā*); it is confirmed immediately by a typically Deuteronomistic reference to the worship of other gods (3:1bβ *wēhēm pônīm ^oel ^oēlohīm ^oāḥērīm* = Deut 5:7 + 31:18, 20) and at the beginning of the next triptych when other commandments are quoted (4:2aβ *wērāšōḥ wēgānōb wēnā^oōp*; cp. Deut 5:17–19 *ršh, n^op, qnb*). The triptych ends with another quotation from Deuteronomy (3:5; cp. Deut 4:29–30): they both suppose that Israel is in exile (2:2; Deut 4:27), but there the Deuteronomist depicts them enslaved in idolatry (Deut 4:28), and the author of the book imagines them finally removed from its occasion (3:2–4); there, both agree, but in differing order, that they will seek Yahweh (*bqš*, 3:5; Deut 4:29) and eventually (*bē^oahārūt hayyāmīm*, 3:5; Deut 4:30) will return to Yahweh (*šwb*, 3:5; Deut 4:30).

and serve him. The quotation is confirmed by an allusion later in the book where the author notes that, in spite of everything, Israel did not return to Yahweh (7:10ba *šwb*) or even seek him (7:10bβ *bqš*).

The second triptych in Hosea's version describes Ephraim's fascination with ritual but it occasionally conceptualizes the problem in language original to Isaiah. The references are slight but clear and cumulative in their effect. The most obvious is Hosea's charge that Ephraim has gone after nonsense (5:11 *šāw*): the anomaly is its unintelligibility, although he explains in the next stanza that it means going to Assyria (5:13a); it is an obvious reference to Isaiah's description of the Assyrians trying to learn Hebrew and speaking nonsense, and it quotes snippets of the text in opposite order (5:11b *hlk* + *šāw*; cp. Isa 28:13 *šāw* + *hlk*); it is confirmed by Hosea's later references to the lies that Isaiah denounced in the same text (*šqr*, *kzb*, 7:1a, 13; Isa 28:15, 17), by his present allusion to the judgement with which Yahweh counters them (*mišpāt*, 5:11; Isa 28:17), and by his final allusion to the dreadful covenant with Death and Sheol that Isaiah foresaw (13:14; Isa 28:15, 18). The triptych actually begins with another quotation from the same text of Isaiah (4:1a *šim'û dēbar YHWH* = Isa 28:14): it is the only time that either prophet uses this expression and it is an unusually aloof departure from Hosea's normal dramatic involvement in his work (cp. 9:7–8, 14, 17); it is addressed to the people and not to the leaders of the people as in Isaiah; it is confirmed by the enigmatic saying at the end of the tableau (4:17 *hannah lô*) which seems to allude to the gist of Isaiah's message (Isa 28:12 *zōʔt hammēnûhāh hānîhû le'āyēp*). Later in the first tableau Hosea abandons his description of the people's rituals to explain that their frustration is due to the fact that they have abandoned Yahweh (4:10b *kî ʔet YHWH ʔāzēbû*). It is from Isaiah's opening discourse but in opposite order (Isa 1:4b *ʔāzēbû ʔet YHWH*). It is confirmed by a series of allusions to the same discourse: Isaiah refers to Israel as the children of Yahweh who have become estranged from him (Isa 1:4 *bānîm . . . nāzōrû ʔāhōr*), and Hosea refers to the estranged children born to Ephraim (5:7 *kî bānîm zārîm yālādû*); Isaiah complains that Israel does not know Yahweh (Isa 1:3), and Hosea insists on the same topic (2:22; 4:1; 6:3; 7:9; 8:2; 11:3); Isaiah calls them sinful and burdened with guilt (1:4 *hṭʔ, ʕwn*), and Hosea portrays them feeding on sin and guilt (4:7); Isaiah describes their military defeat as sickness or a wound that has not been tended and will not heal (Isa 1:5–6, *tukkû, hōlî, lôʔ zōrû, lôʔ hubbāšû*) and Hosea refers to Ephraim's sickness and unhealed wounds (5:13–14a *holyô, māzôr*; 6:1 *yak wēyahbēšēnû*); Isaiah sees the Assyrians devouring their land (Isa 1:7 *zārîm ʔokēlîm ʔōtāh*), and later Hosea adapts the same image to Ephraim's alliances (8:7 *zārîm yiblāʕuhû*). The triptych

also adapts images from Isaiah's description of the Assyrian invasion and applies them directly to Yahweh (5:14; 13:7–8; Isa 5:29): the quotation is confirmed by another allusion to the same passage later in the same triptych (6:3 *wēnēdē^cāh* = Isa 5:19).

The revised version adds another slight reference to the text of Isaiah (4:5 *kšl* = Isa 28:13) but depends mostly on the book of Amos and the Deuteronomistic history for its additions. The book of Amos is the basis of the condemnation of the northern shrines and the priesthood at Bethel. The references in the revised version to the Deuteronomistic history are mostly to the end of the book of Judges and the beginning of the books of Samuel. The most obvious reference to Amos is the exhortation to stay away from Gilgal and Bethel and to avoid saying "Yahweh lives" (4:15): the literal quotation is "Do not go to Gilgal" (4:15b *wē^{al} tābo^u haggilgāl* = Amos 5:5 *wēhaggilgāl lo^o tābō^u*); it is confirmed by the command not to go up to Beth Awen (4:15) that paraphrases the same text in Amos (Amos 5:5) and supposes the saying in that text that Bethel will become nothing (Awen). It is also supported by a paraphrase of Amos' prohibition against going to Beersheba (4:15bβ; cp. Amos 5:5; 8:13–14), by oblique references to the pride of the North (5:5 *gē^on*; cp. Amos 6:8; 7:10), and by reference to the formula for the destruction of a capital city (8:14; cp. Amos 1:4). The references to the Deuteronomistic history are found in the pseudo-historical allusions to places associated with judges and kings: Mizpah (5:1), Gibeah and Ramah (5:8) are important places in the story of the Levite from Ephraim (Judges 19–21; cf. 19:13; 20:1; 21:1) which, in turn, is a counterpoise to the story of Samuel and Saul (1 Sam 8–15); the road to Shechem (6:9) is mentioned only here and in the same narrative (Judg 21:19); Gilead is not a city (6:8), but Jabesh Gilead is a city notorious for the atrocities that were committed against it and is crucial both in the same story (Judg 21:8–10, 14) and in the life of Saul (1 Sam 11); Benjamin is the culprit in the story, and a slogan from the song of Deborah that lists Benjamin among the northern tribes is used to recall this fact (5:8 = Judg 5:14; cp. Judg 19–21); Adam is the city near which the people crossed the Jordan (Josh 3:16 *ābērū*), but the book—with its penchant for tracing things to their origins—takes it as the place where they contravened the covenant (6:7 *ābērū bērit*); Bethel is mentioned (Judg 20:18), and the book refers to it in the derogatory terms taken from Amos (5:8 *bēt āwen*).

In the third triptych Hosea continues to cite Isaiah but also refers to Amos and the usual narrative sources. The revised version, similarly, mentions some of the same sources and refers to the Book of Ezekiel but

mainly persists in its reliance on the Deuteronomistic history.¹³ The quotations from Isaiah are from the same texts that appeared in the second triptych.¹⁴ An obvious quotation from Amos is Hosea's strange contempt for justice that flourishes like weeds in the furrows of the fields (10:4 *ûpārah kārōʿš mišpāt*) that has the same order as Amos' condemnation but contradicts it (Amos 6:12 *kī hāpaktem lēroʿš mišpāt*).¹⁵ In the third tableau Hosea uses the unusual idiom 'to arrange fruit' (10:1 *pēri yēšawweh-lô*) and then explains it by saying that as Israel multiplied its fruit (10:1 *kērob lēpiryô*) so it multiplied its altars (10:1 *hirbāh lam-mizbēhôt*), and embellished its memorial stones (10:1 *hēṭibū maššēbôt*). It is a quotation from the Priestly version of Yahweh's apparition at Bethel where Jacob received the standard blessing "Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen 35:11 *pērēh ûrēbēh*) and proceeded to erect a memorial stone (Gen 35:14 *maššēbāh*). It is confirmed in the following triptych when Hosea paraphrases the Priestly statement that God spoke to Jacob at Bethel (12:5 *bēt ʿēl . . . wēšām yēdabbēr ʿimmānū* = Gen 35:15 *ʾāšer dibber ʿittô šām . . . bēt ʿēl*).

In the fourth triptych Hosea returns to the narrative sources and interweaves them with quotations from the prophets¹⁶ to interpret the stories of Israel, Ephraim and Jacob. In the story of Jacob in particular it is evident that Hosea could distinguish the Pentateuchal sources but was familiar with them in their combined form.¹⁷ The revised version refers to

13. In 9:10ba (*wayyinnāzērû labbōšet*) the author of the book refers to a text of Isaiah (Isa 1:4b *nāzôrû ʾāhôr*) in the language of Ezekiel (Ezek 14:5, 7 *nāzôrû, wēyinnāzēr*) to confirm its earlier quotation from the same text (9:9 = Isa 1:4a). The revision constantly refers to typical Deuteronomistic texts and formulations: the monarchy was established in opposition to Yahweh (8:4; cp. I Sam 8:22); the proper function of a king is to judge (7:7; I Sam 8:20); the end of the monarchy consists in cutting off succession (8:4 *yikkārēt*, cp. I Kgs 2:4; 8:25, etc.); Jeroboam's high place at Bethel became the sin of Israel (10:7–8aa, 10; I Kgs 12:30; II Kgs 17:4, 9); kingship is traced to Gibeah and Gilgal (9:9, 15; 10:9; cp. I Sam 11); Baal Peor was an original sin (9:10b; Num 25:1–5); the calves of Samaria are described in terms of a Deuteronomistic curse on those who make images (8:6 = Deut 27:15).

14. The quotations are odd in their context (7:9aa = Isa 1:7ba; 7:12b = Isa 28:9a, 19b), confirmed by allusions (7:9aβ, 9bβ = Isa 1:3ba; 7:13 = Isa 28:15, 17), and supported by allusions in the revised version to the same texts (7:5b = Isa 28:14a; 7:16aβ = Isa 28:11).

15. Hosea also coined the name Beth Awen from a saying in Amos (10:5; cp. Amos 5:5) and confirmed the quotation by alluding to the pun that Amos constructed in the same place on the name Gilgal (10:5 *yāgilû . . . kī gālāh*; Amos 5:5 *kī haggilgāl gālōh yigleh*).

16. For instance, 5:11 = Amos 4:1; 12:8 = Amos 8:5; 11:4 = Isa 5:18.

17. The Jacob story was composed by J, then revised by P and E: Hosea takes the story as a condemnation of Jacob rather than in its original laudatory sense, and deliberately combines the sources—most notably when he has Jacob wrestle both with God and with

some of the same sources but depends mainly on the Deuteronomistic history¹⁸

Hosea was not alone in trying to understand why the North had fallen or what hope was left. The historians who wrote the Pentateuch and the early version of the Deuteronomistic history all had different solutions—J considering the history of Israel an epic journey filled with dangers and calamities, E convinced of divine providence, P relying on the original promises to the patriarchs, the early Deuteronomist clinging tenaciously to Jerusalem and the Davidic covenant. The prophets were not convinced by these interpretations and were determined to draw the lesson for Judah—Isaiah critical of the kings and filled with foreboding, Amos demanding social reform. But Hosea relived the drama as a family history, and his bold assumption that Yahweh was physically involved in the destiny of his people needed all the support it could get from tradition. However, it found precious little support from the person who revised his work and for whom all the issues had been resolved, less by the events than by their ready interpretation in the Deuteronomistic history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andersen, F. I. and D. N. Freedman. 1980. *Hosea* [*The Anchor Bible*, 24]. Garden City.
- Beentjes, P. C. 1982. "Inverted Quotations in the Bible. A Neglected Stylistic Pattern." *Biblica* 63:506–523
- Childs, B. S. 1979. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia.
- Fishbane, M. 1985. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford.

the angel: 12:4a = Gen 25:23 = 26 [P]; 12:4b = Gen 32:29 [J]; 12:5aa = Gen 32:29 [J] + Gen 32:2 and Gen 33:10 [E]; 12:5aβ = Gen 33:4 [J]; 12:5ba = Gen 35:7 [E]; 12:5bβ = Gen 35:15 [P]; 12:13a = Gen 27:43 [J] + Gen 28:2, 5 [P]; 12:13ba = Gen 29:18 + Gen 30:31 [J]; 12:14 = Exod 32:1, 23 [E].

18. The references to Admah and Seboim are from a speech in Deuteronomy (11:8–9; Deut 29:22–23). Yahweh's roar and the resulting terror are taken from Amos in a contradictory sense (11:10–11; Amos 3:6, 8). The references to Gilead and Gilgal are taken from the Deuteronomistic version of the story of Jacob and Laban (12:12; Gen 31:43–54). A comment on the calves of Samaria is taken from a curse in Deuteronomy (13:2aβ; Deut 27:15). The institution of the monarchy is condemned with a quotation from the Deuteronomistic version (13:9–10; I Sam 8:6aβ).

- Good, E. M. 1966. "The Composition of Hosea." *Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok* 31:21-63.
- Mays, J. L. 1969. *Hosea. A Commentary*. [The Old Testament Library]. Philadelphia.
- Peckham, B. 1985. *The Composition of the Deuteronomistic History*, [Harvard Semitic Monographs, 35] Atlanta.
- Rudolph, W. 1966. *Hosea*. [Kommentar zum Alten Testament]. Gutersloh.
- Van Leeuwen, C. 1968. *Hosea* [De Predeking van het Oude Testament]. Nijkerk.
- Wilson, R. R. 1980. *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia.
- Wolff, H. W. 1965. *Hosea*. [Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament, XIV/1]. Neukirchen-Vluyn.